

## R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George=s County Planning Board has reviewed Zoning Map Amendment Application No. A-9954 requesting a rezoning of a 4.14-acre property from the R-R (Rural Residential) Zone to the L-A-C (Local Activity Center) Zone in accordance with Subtitle 27 of the Prince George=s County Code; and

WHEREAS, after consideration of the evidence presented at the public hearing on May 16, 2002 the Prince George's County Planning Board finds:

- I. Location and Field Inspection: The subject property is located on the north side of Riggs Road, the east side of Edwards Way, and the west side of Adelphi Road, known as 9100 Riggs Road. It comprises approximately 4.14 acres of land and is currently vacant. A foundation of an out- building that was part of a previous residential use and some remnant of the residential structure and a gravel driveway are located on the southern and southeastern portion of the property. The northern part of the property is wooded and is bisected by a partially enclosed storm drainage channel. The property is triangularly shaped and has three street frontages: approximately 471 feet on MD 212 (Riggs Road), approximately 636 feet on Adelphi Road, and approximately 463 feet on Edwards Lane.
- II. History: The 1990 Adopted Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt Sectional Map retained the subject property in the R-R Zone with a recommendation that a comprehensive design technique be used for its redevelopment.
- III. Master Plan Recommendation: The 1989 Master Plan for Langley Park-College Park and Greenbelt recommends the property for low-suburban residential use at a density of 1.6 to 2.6 dwelling units per acre.
- IV. Request: The applicant requests a rezoning of the subject 4.14-acre property from the R-R (Rural Residential) Zone to the L-A-C (Local Activity Center) Zone. The applicant is requesting approval of a Basic Plan for the development of the subject property as a Local Activity Center (L-A-C) at the Aneighborhood@ level. The applicant proposes a commercial development of approximately 29,000 square feet (.16 FAR) as a base density to a maximum density of approximately 56,000 square feet (0.31 FAR). No residential components are proposed.
- V. Neighborhood and Surrounding Uses: Staff defines the following neighborhood boundaries for the subject application:

North - Adelphi Road  
East - Adelphi Road  
South - University Boulevard  
West - New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650)

The immediate neighborhood is characterized by a mixture of residential developments, including high rises (R-H), medium- and high-density apartments (R-10, R-18C, R-30), townhouses (R-T) and single-family detached dwellings (R-R, R-55). The area also contains some commercial developments including Metzerott Plaza, located on the northern edge of the neighborhood, directly across from the subject property (C-S-C), Langley Park Plaza, located at the southwestern corner of the neighborhood at the intersection of New Hampshire Avenue and University Boulevard (C-S-C), and two other small shopping centers CTick Tock Plaza and Adelphi PlazaC located at the southern edge of the neighborhood along University Boulevard (C-S-C, C-M). The Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park traverses the neighborhood east-west. Three elementary schools and a Montessori school are located within the boundaries of the neighborhood.

The subject property is bounded by the following uses:

- North: Across Adelphi Road, the George Washington Memorial Cemetery, in the R-R Zone.
- East: Across Adelphi Road, a couple of church properties, one of which is the subject of special exception (SE-4389), in the R-R Zone.
- South: Metzerott Plaza, a small neighborhood shopping center consisting of about 13 retail and service uses including a Safeway store, A 7-Eleven store, two fast-food restaurants, a bank, a seating restaurant, and a drugstore in the C-S-C Zone.
- West: High-density apartments in the R-10 and R-18 Zones.

VI. Criteria for Approval:

- (1) **Section 27-195(b) of the Zoning Ordinance provides that prior to the approval of the application and the Basic Plan, the applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the District Council, that the entire development meets the following criteria:**

(A) **The proposed Basic Plan shall either conform to:**

- (1) The specific recommendation of a General Plan map, Area Master Plan map; or urban renewal plan map; or the principles and guidelines of the plan text which address the design and physical development of the property, the

public facilities necessary to serve the proposed development, and the impact which the development may have on the environment and surrounding properties; or

- (2) The principles and guidelines described in the Plan (including the text) with respect to land use, the number of dwelling units, intensity of nonresidential buildings, and the location of land uses.

(3)

The subject property is located within planning area 65 and is covered in the 1989 Approved Master Plan and the 1990 Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt (Planning Areas 65, 66, and 67). Upon reviewing the proposal for master plan compliance, the Community Planning Division offered the following comments:

The 1989 *Approved Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt Master Plan* (the Comprehensive Plan Map at the scale of 1"=1,000') recommends single-family detached residential uses at the A Low Suburban@ density up to 2.6 dwelling units per acre for the subject property. The Comprehensive Plan Map shows that the subject property is partially covered by a floating village activity center symbol. The major portion of the symbol is placed on Metzerott Plaza, an existing shopping center at the intersection of Riggs Road and Adelphi Road. Metzerott Plaza contains 13 stores with a total of 64,791 square feet of gross leasable area. The master plan (page 98) defines a village activity center being a center containing 5 to 10 acres of commercial development (50,000 to 100,000 square feet of gross leasable area). Therefore, it appears that the existing commercial development meets the criteria but additional commercial development for this village activity center could be accommodated.

Based on the above analysis, the applicant's proposal is consistent with the master plan's intent to implement a village activity center in this vicinity. However, the size of new commercial development should be limited to a maximum of 40,000 square feet to generally conform with the cap (100,000 square feet of gross leasable area) recommended in the master plan.

The 1990 *Adopted Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt Sectional Map Amendment (Planning Areas 65, 66 and 67) Map* (1' = 1,000' scale) places an asterisk on the subject property. It is recommended that the comprehensive design technique be used for development of the subject property. The map

shows the R-R Zone as the base zone. Thus, the applicant's proposal to use a comprehensive design technique is consistent with this recommendation.

In adopting the Sectional Map Amendment, the District Council addresses the following statements in CR-39-1990 (page 224 of the master plan):

SECTION 2, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the District Council considers the Comprehensive Design zone process the appropriate way to address concerns related to the " 4.1-acre Edwards property bounded by Adelphi Road, Riggs Road, and Edwards Way, although the Sectional Map Amendment retains R-R zoning for this property. The District Council is specifically concerned about preservation, to the greatest possible extent, of the existing woodland and the control of access to the property. A sensitive approach to site development is warranted and should be facilitated through the CDZ process. Accordingly, the SMA text should incorporate this expression of intent and the SMA map should be annotated to reflect the potential for a Comprehensive Design Zone. While the above statement is silent on the recommendation of a specific comprehensive design zone category for the subject site, it is clear that the current R-R Zone is a holding zone.

There is no evidence in the findings of the Community Planning Division's analysis to indicate that the proposal contradicts the specific recommendation of the Master Plan map or the guidelines of the plan's text which address the design and physical development of the property, the public facilities necessary to serve the proposed development, and the impact which the development may have on the environment and surrounding properties. Given the size and shape of the property, and its location relative to existing developments in the immediate neighborhood, and given the fact that the Master Plan does not make specific recommendation for a specific design zone, the proposed L-A-C zoning is the better-suited zoning category for the subject property in terms of consistency with the guidelines of the master plan.

- (A) The economic analysis submitted for a proposed retail commercial area adequately justifies an area of the size and scope shown on the Basic Plan.

A retail market analysis (prepared by G. H. Smith, June 2001) submitted with the application was analyzed by the Research Section. The Research Section found the initial market analysis to be less than convincing in terms of market support for the proposed 40,000 square feet of Anon-gas@ station retail space on the subject property. The Research Section also found that there is no support for a gas station in the market area. Subsequently, the applicant submitted additional materials addressing issues and concerns raised by the Research Section.

In a supplemental memo of March 15, 2002, Dr. Joseph Valenza from the Research Section offered the following comments on the applicant's recent submittal:

I have reviewed the additional material submitted by the applicant for the Edwards property, A 9954. I believe the applicant has made a reasonable case for support of additional retail square footage in the market area. Even if the small amount of retail space occupied by the 7-Eleven and Pizza Hut on New Hampshire Avenue were to be included in the inventory of existing space, there is still support for retail space in this proposal.

The applicant's additional material did not address and I believe, was not intended to address, the support for a gasoline service station so I still believe there is not adequate support for gas station at this site.

The applicant proposes a Local Activity Center (L-A-C) at the Aneighborhood@ level with a commercial development of approximately 29,000 square feet as a base density to a maximum density of approximately 56,000 square feet (0.31 FAR). The proposal does not include a residential component. The existing residential development serves as the residential component of the Aneighborhood.@ Section 27-195(b) (3) specifies that in the case of an L-A-C Zone, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the District Council that any commercial development proposed to serve a specific village, community or neighborhood is either consistent with the Area Master Plan, or is no larger than needed to serve existing and proposed residential development within the village, community or neighborhood [Emphasis added]. As long as the proposal adequately satisfies this requirement, a separate finding of support for a gas station is not required. In both the Community Planning Division's findings concerning Master Plan compliance and the Research Section's findings regarding adequacy of market support for the proposed land use, the proposal's consistency with the master plan has been established. The findings also indicate that the proposed development of the property Aas a neighborhood center@ is within the standards set by the Ordinance with respect to need or/and services in the residential neighborhood.

- (B) Transportation facilities (including streets and public transit) (i) which are existing, (ii) which are under construction, or (iii) for which one hundred percent (100%) of the construction funds are allocated within the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, within the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, or will be provided by the applicant, will be adequate to carry the anticipated traffic generated by the development based on the maximum proposed density. The uses proposed will not generate traffic which would lower the level of service anticipated by the land use and circulation systems shown on the approved General or Area Master Plans, or urban

renewal plans.

Upon review of the applicant's traffic impact study prepared by Traffic Concepts, Inc., Mr. Tom Masog of the Transportation Planning Section has offered the following comments (see attached memos of November 7, 2002, and March 27, 2002, from Mr. Masog).

The traffic impact study prepared and submitted on behalf of the applicant analyzed the following intersections:

MD 212/Adelphi Road  
MD 212/Edwards Way (unsignalized)  
MD 212/site access/Metzerott Plaza (unsignalized)  
Adelphi Road/Edwards Way (unsignalized)

Existing conditions in the vicinity of the subject property are summarized as follows:

EXISTING CONDITIONS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
MD 212/Adelphi Road	1,367	1,440	D	D
MD 212/Edwards Way	23.4*	48.6*	--	--
MD 212/site access/Metzerott Plaza access	22.6*	24.1*	--	--
Adelphi Road/Edwards Way	206.9*	183.6*	--	--
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According the <i>Guidelines</i> , an average delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Delays of +999 are outside the range of the procedures, and should be interpreted as excessive.				

A review of background operating conditions in the area was conducted by the applicant. Staff could not identify any significant approved developments in the area. To account for some growth in traffic in the area, the traffic study assumed a growth rate of 1.0 percent per year over two years. There are no funded capital improvements in the area. Background conditions are summarized as follows:

BACKGROUND CONDITIONS		
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)	Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)

MD 212/Adelphi Road	1,395	1,469	D	E
MD 212/Edwards Way	24.1*	51.2*	--	--
MD 212/site access/Metzerott Plaza access	23.4*	24.9*	--	--
Adelphi Road/Edwards Way	242.6*	214.0*	--	--
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According the <i>Guidelines</i> , an average delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Delays of +999 are outside the range of the procedures, and should be interpreted as excessive.				

The traffic study assumes two development scenarios: one considering 28,850 square feet of retail space, and one assuming 55,900 square feet of retail space. Several comments need to be made at this point:

- \$ Since the two scenarios only differ in the quantity of trips generated and the site, if rezoned, could accept the larger development quantity, staff=s recommendation will be based on the larger quantity. To the extent that it is appropriate, improvements will be phased according to the amount of development; this should allow sufficient flexibility for the analysis of future applications.
- \$ As noted earlier, the *Guidelines* do not assume that retail space generates AM peak-hour travel. However, staff=s analysis is considering this possibility by using rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers= *Trip Generation Manual* and providing the AM peak-hour assessment.
- \$ The site is estimated to generate 113 AM peak-hour vehicle trips (69 in, 44 out) and 670 PM peak-hour vehicle trips (335 in, 335 out), according to the rates given in the *Guidelines* or computed using the *Trip Generation Manual*.
- \$ The *Guidelines* allow retail uses to assume that a portion of trips are pass-by trips, that is, trips that are already driving past the site on the adjacent roadway prior to the use being in place. For a retail center less than 100,000 square feet, the *Guidelines* allow up to 60 percent of trips generated to be pass-by trips. The traffic study has used 50 percent, and while this may slightly overstate the site impact, staff=s analysis uses 50 percent in both peak hours. This results in the following trip generation for **new trips**: AMC57 trips (41 in, 16 out); PMC336 trips (168 in, 168 out).
- \$ The site trip distribution, both for new trips and for pass-by trips, are clearly shown and are acceptable. Full access into the site is proposed

from MD 212 and from Edwards Way, with right-in right-out access only from Adelphi Road.

With the proposed development in place, the following total traffic conditions would result:

TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
MD 212/Adelphi Road	1,409	1,514	D	E
MD 212/Edwards Way	26.0*	102.9*	--	--
MD 212/site access/Metzerott Plaza access	26.2*	54.6*	--	--
Adelphi Road/Edwards Way	248.3*	265.8*	--	--
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According the <i>Guidelines</i> , an average delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Delays of +999 are outside the range of the procedures, and should be interpreted as excessive.				

Under total traffic, the one critical signalized intersection under study would operate unacceptably. The *Guidelines* identify signalized intersections operating at LOS E or F during any peak hour as unacceptable. In response to the inadequacy, the applicant recommends that a double left-turn lane along southbound MD 212 at Adelphi Road be constructed. With that improvement in place, the critical intersection would operate at LOS C with a CLV of 1,195 in the AM peak hour and LOS D with a CLV of 1,370 in the PM peak hour.

The Prince George's County Planning Board, in the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*, has defined vehicle delay in any movement exceeding 50.0 seconds as an unacceptable operating condition at unsignalized intersections. In response to such a finding, the Planning Board has often imposed a condition to perform a traffic signal warrant study in similar circumstances. The signal warrant study is a more detailed study of the adequacy of an unsignalized intersection, and it focuses upon operations at the intersection under study as well as interactions with operations at neighboring intersections. All three unsignalized intersections under operate with excessive delay in at least one vehicle movement during at least one peak hour. Based on the information provided, staff has the following comments:

\$ The applicant recommends that the needed warrant studies be done for



the Adelphi Road/Edwards Way intersection, and staff concurs.

- § The applicant suggests that a signal may not be warranted at either the MD 212/ Edwards Way intersection or the MD 212/site entrance intersection. Staff agrees in general that a signal certainly will not be warranted at both locations, and possibly at neither. This may be due in part to low volumes from the side streets, and in part to the presence of nearby signals north (at Adelphi Road) and south (at Metzert Road) of these intersections.

The operating agencies have raised a number of issues with the recommendations of the study. The agencies' comments include (with transportation planning staff responses in italics):

1. First bullet CDPW&T: Lane widths on all legs of the MD 212/Adelphi Road intersection are substandard, and there is insufficient right-of-way to construct a double left-turn lane along southbound/westbound MD 212. *Given that the proposed activity center is relatively small, the need to acquire additional right-of-way could be a factor in the viability of the property for development. Better evidence needs to be provided which indicates that the improvement is implementable. This must occur prior to the approval of the zone, in staff's opinion.*
2. Second bullet CDPW&T: The access point along MD 212 is unacceptable as it would conflict with the left-turn storage lane along eastbound/northbound MD 212. *An access point already exists at this location for the shopping center on the opposite side of MD 212. SHA will need to evaluate this access point and has the authority to approve or disapprove it. In any regard, the site would have full access along Edwards Way and so the access point along MD 212 may be desirable but not essential.*
- 3.

4. Third & fourth bulletsCDPW&T: The comments simply state that the applicant will need to provide frontage improvements along Adelphi Road and that a reconstruction of the signal at MD 212 may be needed. *This is a consideration for the applicant and does not affect staff=s findings.*
5. Fifth bulletCDPW&T: The comment agrees that signalization at Adelphi Road and Edwards Way should be studied, with the applicant responsible for the design and installation of the signal, if warranted. *This condition will be recommended by staff.*
6. Sixth bulletCDPW&T: The proposed site access along Adelphi Road should be located 400 feet north of MD 212. *This condition will be recommended by staff.*
7. First bulletCSHA: The comment indicates that design and approval of site access along MD 212 must be coordinated with the Engineering Access Permit Division of SHA. *This is information for the applicant, and does not affect staff=s findings.*
8. Second & third bulletsCSHA: These comments restate the major findings of the traffic study. *SHA continues by agreeing with the proposed condition at MD 212/Adelphi Road and defers to the county regarding plans for signalization at Adelphi Road/Edwards Way.*

With the improvements that would be built as a part of the proposed development of 55,900 square feet of retail space, all intersections in the study area would operate acceptably under total traffic in both peak hours. It is clear that there are operational issues concerning the unsignalized intersections which were studied, but

these issues can, at the very least, be resolved with signalization. A more critical question concerns the MD 212/Adelphi Road intersection. While the proposed improvement does provide adequacy, there is a right-of-way question which has been raised which should be resolved.

#### Analysis of Traffic ImpactsCLong-Term (Buildout)

If the subject site were intended to be developed as an R-80 subdivision, the site would have generated about 125 daily trips. Under the proposed retail use, the property would generate over 2,200 daily trips. While this is a significant increase in traffic, it is probably not sufficient to pose new master plan transportation facility issues.

Access to the site remains an issue. The site cannot have full access onto Adelphi Road; there is an existing median and limited right-of-way due to the presence of a cemetery on the north side of Adelphi Road to the west of Edwards Way. DPW&T has indicated that there may be an issue with access onto MD 212. This potentially leaves Edwards Way as the main access into a retail center on this site, and Edwards Way has never been planned to be a commercial roadway. It must be noted, however that SHA, and not DPW&T, has final permit authority for an access point along MD 212. SHA reviewed the plan and the traffic study and did not raise an objection, so the transportation staff must presume that SHA could approve an access point if the rezoning were to be granted and such a request was made.

An examination of existing right-of-way by the applicant indicates that sufficient right-of-way does exist for the improvement which is proposed in the traffic study, and the transportation staff is satisfied that adequate right-of-way exists

along MD 212 on the north side of Adelphi Road. Subdivision plans will be required to show the following dedication along the frontages of the subject property: MD 212C40 feet from center line (toward ultimate right-of-way of 80 feet); Adelphi RoadC50 feet from center line (toward ultimate right-of-way of 100 feet); Edwards WayC35 feet from center line (in accordance with Zoning Ordinance requirements adjacent to a commercial zone).

The requirements pertaining to transportation facilities under Section 27-195 of the Prince George's County Code would be met if the application is approved with the following conditions:

1. Subdivision plans will be required to show the following dedication along the frontages of the subject property: MD 212C40 feet from center line (toward ultimate right-of-way of 80 feet); Adelphi RoadC50 feet from center line (toward ultimate right-of-way of 100 feet); Edwards WayC35 feet from center line (in accordance with Zoning Ordinance requirements adjacent to a commercial zone).
2. The applicant will provide a double left-turn lane along southbound/westbound MD 212 at the approach to Adelphi Road. Timing of this improvement will be determined at preliminary plan of subdivision.

3. Prior to the approval of the Specific Design Plan for the subject property, the applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to the county Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) for the intersection of Adelphi Road and Edwards Way. The applicant should utilize a new 12-hour count and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic.
4. During the review of preliminary plat of subdivision, the applicant shall provide more detailed operational analyses at the intersections of MD 212/Edwards Way and MD 212/site entrance. The scope of these analyses will be determined after approval of the proposed Basic Plan, and in consideration of the permitted access to the site.
5. Total development of this 4.14 acre site shall be limited to 55,900 square feet of retail uses in the L-A-C Zone, or equivalent development generating no more than 57 AM and 336 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. Any development other than that identified herein above shall require a Basic Plan amendment with a new determination of the adequacy of

transportation facilities.

In memorandum dated March 22, 2002, the Subdivision Section indicated that a preliminary plan, final plat and record plat will be required for any development that exceeds 5,000 square feet of gross floor area. Moreover, noting that Section 24-121 of the Subdivision Regulations prohibits direct access from lots or parcels to arterial roadways, the Subdivision Section has advised that either public streets should be created to accomplish access from Adelphi Road or a variation to this regulation must be obtained from the Planning Board during its review of the preliminary plan.

- (D) Other existing or planned private and public facilities which are existing, under construction, or for which construction funds are contained in the first six (6) years of the adopted County Capital Improvement Program (such as schools, recreation areas, water and sewerage systems, libraries, and fire stations) will be adequate for the uses proposed;**

Water and Sewer: The applicant has indicated that the subject property is currently in water service category W-3 and sewer service category S-3, which designates that adequate system capacity exists or the necessary improvements are included in the current WSSC Capital Improvement Program.

Fire and Rescue Facilities: The existing fire engine service at Chillum-Adelphi, Company 34, is located at 7833 Riggs Road has a service response time of 3.22 minutes, which is within the 3.25-minute response time guideline. However, the existing ladder truck service at College Park, Company 12, that is located on 7507 Baltimore Avenue has a service response time of 5.16 minutes, which is slower than the 4.25-minute response time guideline. It is recommended, in order to minimize the deficiency in response time, a sprinkler system be provided throughout all structures.

The existing ambulance service at Chillum-Adelphi, Company 34, located at 7833 Riggs Road, has a service response time of 3.22 minutes, which is within the 4.25-minute response time guideline.

The existing paramedic service at College Park, Company 12, located on 7507 Baltimore Avenue, has a service response time of 5.16 minutes, which is within the 7.25-minute response time guideline.

Police Services: The subject property is within the service area of District I- Hyattsville.

Moreover, the Prince George's County Police Department has a satellite office for the Community-Oriented Police Program in the Metzerott Plaza shopping center, south of the subject property across Riggs Road. In addition, the applicant is willing to design a permanent space on site to accommodate the community police program as part of the proposed neighborhood activity center.

The existing facilities are adequate for the proposed development of the property as a neighborhood activity center with L-A-C Zoning. Other facilities, such as schools, libraries and parks are not likely to be impacted by the proposed development of the property. The applicant's offer to provide a space for a community police program is an amenity to the community; however, it should be coordinated with the Police Department.

**(E) Environmental relationships reflect compatibility between the proposed general land use types, or if identified, the specific land use types, and surrounding land uses, so as to promote the health, safety, and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the Regional District.**

The Environmental Planning Section reviewed the proposal and offered the following comments:

No streams, wetlands or floodplain occur on the site. The northern one-third of the site is wooded. No historic or scenic roads are affected by this proposal. No rare/threatened/endangered species are known to occur on the project site. According to the Sewer Service and Water Service maps produced by DER, the property is in categories W-3 and S-3. The soils on the site are in the Manor and Chillum soils series. These soils pose few difficulties to development. An assessment of noise impacts is not necessary because the zoning application requests a commercial zone.

A Forest Stand Delineation and a Tree Conservation Plan are not required at this time. The current zoning of the property has a woodland conservation requirement of 20 percent. The L-A-C Zone, which is proposed, has a woodland conservation requirement of 15 percent. Because the entire site is within the Developed Tier and in the Anacostia River watershed, retention of the woodland conservation threshold of 20 percent is appropriate. If the future development of this site results in a need for off-site mitigation to meet the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance, it is also appropriate that the mitigation be provided within the Anacostia Watershed if possible.

The development of the subject property as proposed will be compatible with the surrounding land uses, provided that design and adequate landscaping features are employed with sensitivity to the high visibility of the site with three street frontages. The Urban Design Review Section has offered the following comments with regard to the future development of the subject property:

This highly visible site will require careful planning and design in the development of the property. Therefore, the following issues should be addressed at the time of review of the Comprehensive Design Plan and Specific Design Plan:

- (A) Architectural design shall be distinctive in order to create an image of quality and permanence.
  - (B) A build -to-line shall be considered in order to create an inviting streetscape.
  - (C) The streetscape shall create a pedestrian friendly environment with consideration of the following elements:
    - (1) Street furniture including pedestrian lighting
    - (2) Trash receptacles
    - (3) Bike racks
    - (4) Pedestrian crosswalks should be a contrasting paving material
    - (5) Need for bus stop
  - (D) Massive surface parking facilities adjacent to either Riggs Road or Adelphi Road shall be prohibited.
  - (E) An architectural focal point and/or sculpture located within a green area shall be provided at the intersection of Adelphi and Riggs Road.
  - (F) No loading and/or dumpster areas shall be visible from adjacent roadways.@
  - (G) The design plans shall address the entire property, so that the final development of the individual lots creates a visually cohesive development, compatible in regard to architectural treatment and site layout.
- (1) Notwithstanding subparagraphs (C) and (D), above, where the application anticipates a construction schedule of more than six (6) years (Section 27-179), public facilities (existing or scheduled for construction within the first six (6) years) will be adequate to serve the development proposed to occur within the first six (6) years. The Council shall also find that public facilities probably will be adequately supplied for the remainder of the project. In considering the probability of future public facilities construction,



the Council may consider such things as existing plans for construction, budgetary constraints on providing public facilities, the public interest and public need for the particular development, the relationship of the development to public transportation, or any other matter that indicates that public or private funds will likely be expended for the necessary facilities.

The applicant proposes to develop the entire project within six years. Therefore, this criterion is not applicable.

VII. Purposes of the L-A-C Zone:

- (1) Establish (in the public interest) a plan implementation zone, in which (among other things):
  - (A) Permissible residential density and building intensity are dependent on providing public benefit features and related density/intensity increment factors.
  - (B) The location of the zone must be in accordance with the adopted and approved General Plan, master plan or public urban renewal plan.
- (1) Establish regulations through which adopted and approved public plans and policies (such as the General Plan, master plan, and public urban renewal plan for community, village, and neighborhood centers) can serve as criteria for judging individual physical development proposals.
- (2) Assure the compatibility of proposed land uses with existing and proposed surrounding land uses, and existing and proposed public facilities and services, so as to promote the health safety and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the regional district.
- (3) Encourage and stimulate balanced land development.

- (4) Group uses serving public, quasi-public, and commercial needs together for the convenience of the populations they serve.
- (5) Encourage dwellings integrated with activity centers in a manner which retains the amenities of the residential environment and provides the convenience of proximity to an activity center.

The basic plan proposes a base density of .16 FAR (28,854.14 square feet) with a maximum density of .31 FAR. The applicant acknowledges the fact that a building intensity of greater than .16 FAR requires that public benefit features must be provided for the residential neighborhood. The applicant has indicated that the specific intensity increment factors will be identified at the time of Comprehensive Design Plan review.

The proposed basic plan is in compliance with the approved master plan. Although silent on the specific zoning category, the master plan recommends that a comprehensive design technique be used for the development of the subject property. Given the existing residential developments, the adjoining C-S-C Zoned shopping plaza, and the size, shape and location of the subject property itself, the proposed L-A-C Zone/neighborhood activity center is an appropriate development mechanism for the subject property. With the recommended conditions, the proposed L-A-C development will be compatible with all surrounding land uses and will provide balanced on-site development and commercial services that would benefit the community.

VIII. The Planning Board finds that the proposed basic plan for rezoning of the subject 4.14-acre property from R-R to L-A-C meets all of the criteria. With the recommended conditions, the development of the property as a neighborhood activity center will be consistent with the master plan and will be in harmony with the purposes of the L-A-C Zone. Furthermore, since the property is surrounded by three streetsC Adelphi Road (arterial), Riggs Road

(collector) and Edwards Lane (local)C a number of issues are raised concerning the adequacy of transportation facilities and the high visibility of the site. However, these issues can be resolved with appropriate conditions.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George=s County Code, the Prince George=s County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and recommends to the District Council for Prince George=s County, Maryland that the above-noted application be APPROVED, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Basic Plan shall be revised to show the following rights of way along the frontages of the subject property: MD 212C40 feet from center line (toward the ultimate right-of-way of 80 feet); Adelphi RoadC50 feet from center line (toward the ultimate right-of-way of 100 feet); Edwards WayC35 feet from center line (in accordance with Zoning Ordinance requirements adjacent to a commercial zone).
2. The applicant will provide a double left-turn lane along southbound/westbound MD 212 at the approach to Adelphi Road. Timing of this improvement will be determined at the preliminary plan of subdivision.
3. Prior to the approval of the Specific Design Plan for the subject property, the applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to the county Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) for the intersection of Adelphi Road and Edwards Way. The applicant shall use a new 12-hour count and shall analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic.
4. During the review of preliminary plan of subdivision, the applicant shall provide more detailed operational analyses at the intersections of MD 212/Edwards Way and MD 212/ site entrance. The scope of these analyses will be determined after approval of the proposed Basic

Plan and in consideration of the permitted access to the site.

5. Total commercial development of the subject 4.14-acre site shall be limited to a maximum of 40,000 square feet.
6. During the Comprehensive Design Plan and subdivision review, the applicant shall address the addition of public streets to accomplish access from Adelphi Road or obtain a variance from Section 24-121 of the Subdivision Regulations.
7. Development of the subject property shall have a woodland conservation threshold of 20 percent. If off-site mitigation is proposed, the first priority for mitigation sites shall be within the Anacostia watershed.
8. During the Comprehensive Design Plan and the Specific Design Plan review, the applicant shall address the following issues:
  - A. Architectural design shall be distinctive in order to create an image of quality and permanence.
  - B. A build-to-line shall be considered in order to create an inviting streetscape.
  - C. The streetscape shall create a pedestrian-friendly environment with consideration of the following elements:
    - (1) Street furniture including pedestrian lighting
    - (2) Trash receptacles
    - (3) Bike racks
    - (4) Pedestrian crosswalks should be a contrasting paving material
    - (5) Need for bus stop
  - D. Massive surface parking facilities adjacent to either Riggs Road or Adelphi Road shall be prohibited.
  - E. An architectural focal point and/or sculpture located within a green area shall be provided at the intersection of Adelphi and Riggs Road.

F. No loading and/or dumpster areas shall be visible from adjacent roadways.

G. The design plans shall address the entire property, so that the final development of the individual lots creates a visually cohesive development, compatible in regard to architectural treatment and site layout.

\* \* \* \* \*

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Lowe, seconded by Commissioner Scott, with Commissioners Lowe, Scott, Brown and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Eley absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, May 16, 2002, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 6th day of June 2002.

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:ET:rmk  
(Revised 8/9/01)